

**Advisory Committee on Land Record Modernization Standards**  
**Meeting Notes 5-06-2004**  
*by Erik Hubl*

Larry opened the meeting and all in attendance introduced themselves. Larry gave a brief outline on the events that led up to the creation of this committee. Five of the representatives were part of previous committees and as such have a fair amount of background on the matter.

Larry identified that our charge might exist in several aspects.

Attribute Standards and Geospatial Standards

With Funding and/or Without funding

Attribute standards might include a number of different criteria but a useful beginning is to seek what DPAT requires in the form of assessment abstracts from the various counties.

Geospatial standards might include the digital line work and control that forms parcels and lots. This line work usually originates from the metes and bounds and the legal descriptions that connect that piece of land to a particular place on the earth.

The with funding option would develop these standards with potential funding in mind. This funding would provide a pool of financial resources to assist counties to develop GIS projects.

Without funding would be a minimal set of standards with the hope that GIS projects would willingly adhere to.

It was stated that there are only 3 or 4 vendors in Nebraska offering CAMA

Terrascan  
MIPS  
CAPS  
Colorado Customeware – Omaha  
CLT (Cole Layer & Trumbell) Lincoln

There are multiple variations of a “unique” parcel ID structure that are being used throughout Nebraska. Gail brought up the concern of the variety. In past committees, discussion has centered on the concept of adding a specific county designated number to the front of that county's parcel ID structure. In theory it should create a completely unique number within the boundaries of Nebraska.

The state should have a minimum set of attribute requirements that it needs. What are they? Does the assessment abstract contain those items?

We need to identify the needs of the NRD's, the cities and the counties as they relate to parcel and ownership areas. Presumably they have a more detailed set of attribute needs than the state may have?

As Jim pointed out, currently there is a lot of re-keying of information that goes on. He said the primary use of the Real Estate Transfer Document is to collect doc stamp fees by DOR. A funding portal. This year they experimented with electronic transfers of information but that process still needs some fine tuning.

Ratio studies are also ran by DPAT using the real estate transfer document information.

As for geospatial standards (line work) standards need to be addressed for instances of using COGO (coordinate geometry) vs. digitizing lines off aerials.

Larry pointed out that the intention of this committee is to build upon the existing guidebook.

Phelps and Franklin counties were discussed. A Vendor had created a GIS with lack of good spatial control such as surveyed section corners and had combined multiple thematic layers into one. Layers such as parcels, soils, zoning etc.). But it was pointed out that it may cost over \$500 per section corner to GPS and more money to COGO than to digitize. One can assume that individual assessor's are being presented with both options by vendors.

Discussion then moved to deeded acres vs actual acres. Areas of land where GIS evidence indicates a different area amount than what is stated in the deed. According to one of the vendors present, half the counties utilize a deeded area (such as Lancaster) and some utilize a digital map derived area. Some area vendors have even developed proportioning tools to mathematically proportion the differences for any derivative area (i.e. combining parcels with soil areas and proportioning against the total deeded area).

Duane showed us a July 2003 document produced by the IAAO (International Association of Assessment Officers) called "Standards on Digital Cadastral Maps and Parcel Identifiers". We should all get a copy of this for review.

Jim pointed out that his department basically has two functions: 1.) Distribute state aid and 2.) perform 9 county assessment duties.

Larry suggested that we need to make the case that the state needs this data, in particular DPAT. If we can do that, then it might be able to drive this forward.

Larry asked us to capture some issues relating to this topic:

#### Attributes

- Appraisal
- Assessment

#### Local Data

- Local Stds/Guidelines
- State government )
- NRDs ) – Identify Data Needs
- Cities )

#### Define Layers

Survey Control

Coordinate System

COGO vs. Imagery (digitized lines)

Vendor Software

Unique Parcel ID

Split parcels IDs/History/parent-child relationship

Updates

Spatial Accuracy

Fence vs. Deed resolution

Philosophy of attributing (all or minimal)

Transfer standard for spatial data

Legal subdivision vs. Ownership parcel

Data Model

Middleware to capture data for statewide integration

Metadata

Public Access to Data

District boundaries vs. datafields

The distance between the source of a change and those who need the info.

#### Attributes

- NPAT

#### Geospatial

- NGPC
- SSO
- NDNR
- DEconDev
- NRD
- NDOR

#### Some suggested attributes:

- Owner
- Address – Situs
- Mailing address
- Land Value
- Improvement values
- Total values
- Zoning
- Existing landuse
- Planned landuse (future use/Comprehensive plans/Zoning etc)
- Ag Land use
- Legal Description
- Flood Plain status
- Deeded acres
- Mineral rights
- Easements

#### Audience of Stds and Guidelines

#### Dissemination of Stds. and Information

#### Warehousing of Data